

NOAA comments on OGC document #06-141r6, "Ordering Services for Earth Observation Products Interface Standard"

Major issues:

1. This specification should include diagrams or text explaining the role of this service within the overall architectural context of OGC Web Services. Does this spec define an Ordering Service that could be layered over existing OGC services that do not provide ordering capabilities (WCS, WMS, SOS)? Or does this spec define an end-to-end service that includes product generation and description functions analogous to WCS GetCoverage and DescribeCoverage?
2. The definition of "Earth Observation Product" is incomplete, and must be made very explicit because it is a core aspect of the specification. Does a single satellite scene count as a product? What about a swath? What about a global mosaic? Or a time series of all scenes that include a selected location? Is it possible to produce subsets of a single scene, or to stitch multiple scenes and then subset a bounding box from that? Are all of the following considered Products: Raw Data Records (RDRs), Sensor Data Records (SDRs), Temperature Data Records (TDRs), Deliverable Intermediate Products (IPs), Environmental Data Records (EDRs), Application Related Products (ARPs)? Is data from an in situ sensor an EO Product?
3. The essential information that this is a SOAP service should be mentioned much earlier than p.94.
4. Please add material summarizing implementation experience. Does this service represent entirely new functionality that has never been implemented, or does it codify services already in existence at the submitting organizations? If services already exist, do they implement all of the conformance classes or only some? Is a reference implementation available? Clause E.3.2 says, "The Ordering Service described in this document has been successfully implemented in Java" -- this would be helpful information to provide much earlier to (a) give confidence to other TC members that a "Yes" vote is warranted and (b) give hope to potential implementers that they need not start from scratch to implement this 294-page specification.

Editorial comments:

5. The Requirement Classes could be presented much more readably. A phrase like "specifies the requirements an Order Server shall implement" is repeated in every item, and it would be better to focus the list on what functionality each class actually provides.
6. I congratulate the Italian editor on his knowledge of English, which is molto meglio than my knowledge of Italian (I had to use Google Translate to get that last bit.) Nevertheless, a native speaker should review this document carefully and fix the spelling and grammar problems.
7. Replace "has to" with "must" or "shall" throughout the document.
8. Should check the list of Abbreviations and delete terms used only 0 or 1 times, and add any missing terms.
9. Either SOAP 1.1 is permitted or it is forbidden--this sentence contradicts the paragraph above and the reference to mandatory SOAP 1.2 in Clause 7.4.
10. Does OGC require that this general information about UML (Clause 5.2) be included? If not, recommend deletion of these 3-4 pages.
11. Does OGC require that this general information about XML schema notation (Clause 5.3) be included in every spec? If not, recommend deletion.